Lepton flavor non-universality in the B-sector: a global analyses of various new physics models

Ashutosh Kumar Alok* and Ruchi Sharma†
Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, Jodhpur 342011, India

Jacky Kumar‡
Department of High Energy Physics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 400005, Mumbai, India

Dinesh Kumar§
Department of Physics, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur 302004, India

arXiv:1704.07347v2 [hep-ph] 26 Apr 2017

The recent measurement of $R_{K^*} \equiv \Gamma(B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma(B^0 \to K^{*0}e^+e^-)$ by LHCb collaboration along with the previous measurements of $R_K \equiv \Gamma(B^+ \to K^+\,\mu^+\,\mu^-)/\Gamma(B^+ \to K^+\,e^+\,e^-)$ and $R_{D^{(*)}} \equiv \Gamma(B \to D^{(*)}\,\tau\bar{\nu})/\Gamma(B \to D^{(*)}\,l\bar{\nu})$ ($l = e,\,\mu$) hint towards lepton flavor non universality. In this work we look for simultaneous explanations of these measurements in standard model like vector bosons and $SU(2)_L$-singlet vector leptoquark models. By performing a global fit to all relevant data in the B sector, we obtain predictions for R_{K^*} and R_K in these models in the low, central and high q^2-bins. We find that these models can explain the present LHCb measurements for R_{K^*} and R_K while being consistent with the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ data. Thus these models can account for the lepton non universality in the B-sector, indicated by the measurements of LHCb and B-factories.

I. INTRODUCTION

Apart from confirming some of the prevailing anomalies in the B-sector, the currently running LHC has provided several new measurements which hint towards physics beyond standard model (SM). Some of these measurements are indicating towards lepton universality violation. The most striking measurement hinting towards lepton flavor non universality is the $R_{D^{(*)}} \equiv \Gamma(B \to D^{(*)}\,\tau\bar{\nu})/\Gamma(B \to D^{(*)}\,l\bar{\nu})$ ($l = e,\,\mu$) [1–6] which disagrees with the SM at the level of $\sim 3.5\ \sigma$. This was further corroborated by the measurement of $R_K \equiv \Gamma(B^+ \to K^+\,\mu^+\,\mu^-)/\Gamma(B^+ \to K^+\,e^+\,e^-) = 0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074}\ (\text{stat}) \pm 0.036\ (\text{syst})$ [7]. This measurement was performed in the low dilepton invariant mass-squared q^2 range ($1.0 \le q^2 \le 6.0\,\text{GeV}^2$) and it deviates from the SM prediction, which is $\simeq 1$, by $2.6\ \sigma$. Very recently, the LHCb Collaboration has announced the measurement of $R_{K^*} \equiv \Gamma(B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma(B^0 \to K^{*0}e^+e^-)$ [8]:

$$R_{K^*}^{[0.045,1.1]} = 0.660^{+0.110}_{-0.070}\ (\text{stat}) \pm 0.024\ (\text{syst})\,, \quad (1)$$

$$R_{K^*}^{[1.1,6.0]} = 0.685^{+0.113}_{-0.069}\ (\text{stat}) \pm 0.047\ (\text{syst}). \quad (2)$$

where the superscript denotes the dilepton invariant mass-squared q^2 range. These measurements differ from the SM prediction, which is $\simeq 1$, by 2.2-2.4σ in the low-q^2 region and by 2.4-2.5σ in the central-q^2 region. Apart from these, there are other measurements, all in the $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ sector, which show discrepancies with the SM. The measurement of some of the angular observables [9–11], in particular P_5', disagrees with the SM predictions [12] at the level of 4σ in the 4.3-8.68 q^2-bin. This disagreement is further supported by the recent measurements by ATLAS [13] and CMS [14] collaboration. Also, there is tension in the branching ratio of $B_s \to \phi\mu^+\mu^-$[15, 16]. Therefore $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ and $b \to c\,\tau\,\bar{\nu}$ decays are very important in the context of hunting beyond SM physics.

In order to identify the Lorentz structure of new physics responsible for various anomalies in the $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ sector, in a model-independent way, there have been a plethora of works in recent times. After the announcement of R_{K^*} results by LHCb, several model independent and dependent analysis have been done [17]. However, simultaneous explanation of anomalies in $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ and $b \to c\,\tau\,\bar{\nu}$ sector in specific new physics models is bit tricky. This is because the $b \to c\,\tau\,\bar{\nu}$ transition occurs at the tree level within the SM whereas $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ decay can only occur at the loop level. One needs a relatively large new physics contributions in order to explain the R_{D^*} anomaly. However such a large new physics contributions must also be consistent with the measurement of other observables which are in agreement with their SM predictions. Therefore there are only a limited set of new physics models which can simultaneously explain the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ anomalies, such as [18–29].

Out of these models, where it were shown that R_K and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ can be explained simultaneously, we consider two models: (1) SM like vector bosons and (2) $SU(2)_L$-singlet vector leptoquark models [27]. For each of these models, we first perform a global fit to all relevant experimental data, which includes various measurements in the $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ and $b \to c\,\tau\,\bar{\nu}$ sectors, except R_K and R_{K^*}, to obtain constraints on the new physics couplings. We then

*akalok@iitj.ac.in
†sharma.16@iitj.ac.in
‡jka@tifr.res.in
§dinesh@uniraj.ac.in

obtain predictions for R_K and R_{K^*} in these models in the low [0.045-1.1], central [1.1-6.0] and high [15.0-22.0] q^2 bins. The LHCb is expected to provide measurements of R_{K^*} in high q^2-bins. We find that these models can simultaneously explain the present LHCb measurements for R_{K^*} and R_K while being consistent with the LHCb and B-factories measurements of $R_{D^{(*)}}$.

The paper is arranged as follows. After the introduction, we briefly discuss the methodology used for the global fit. In Sec. III, we discuss various new physics models. In Sec. IV, we present our results for new physics couplings and predictions for R_K and R_{K^*}. Finally, in Sec. IV, we present our conclusions.

II. METHODOLOGY

In order to obtain constrains on new physics couplings, we perform global fits to following observables:

1. $R_{D^{(*)}}$ [1–6].
2. The branching ratio of $B_s^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ [30, 31],
3. the differential branching ratio of $B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ and $B^+ \to K^{*+}\mu^+\mu^-$ measured by LHCb [32, 33],
4. the CP-averaged differential angular distribution for $B^0 \to K^{*0}(\to K^+\pi^-)\mu^+\mu^-$ [10],
5. the differential branching ratio of $B^0 \to K^0\mu^+\mu^-$ and $B^+ \to K^+\mu^+\mu^-$ measured by LHCb[32] and CDF[34],
6. the differential branching ratio of $B_s^0 \to \phi\mu^+\mu^-$ by LHCb[16] and CDF[34]and the angular observables measured by LHCb[16],
7. the differential branching ratio of $B \to X_s\mu^+\mu^-$ measured by BaBar[35], and

Apart from this, we have also included the recent data by ATLAS[36] and CMS[37] for the angular observables in $B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ decay. Depending upon a particular new physics model, we include additional relevant observables as constraints, such as, B_s^0-$\bar{B}_s^0$ mixing.

We do a χ^2 fit using CERN minimization code `MINUIT` [38–40]. The χ^2 function is defined as

$$\chi^2(C_i) = \left(\mathcal{O}_{th}(C_i) - \mathcal{O}_{exp}\right)^T \mathcal{C}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{O}_{th}(C_i) - \mathcal{O}_{exp}\right). \quad (3)$$

The theoretical predictions, $\mathcal{O}_{th}(C_i)$ are calculated using `flavio` [41]. $\mathcal{O}_{exp}$ are the experimental measurements of the observables used in the fit. The total covariance matrix $\mathcal{C}$ is obtained by adding the individual theoretical and experimental covariance matrices. We follow the methodology for global fits as given in Ref [42, 43].

III. NEW PHYSICS MODELS

In this section, we briefly discuss the new physics models which we have considered in our analyses. We specifically work in the setup in which the new physics couples only to the third generation in the gauge basis through the following operator

$$\frac{G}{\Lambda^2}(\bar{b'_L}\gamma_\mu b'_L)(\bar{\tau'_L}\gamma^\mu \tau'_L). \quad (4)$$

this operator was used to explain the R_K anomaly in Ref.[44]. Here Λ is the scale of new physics. We write effective Lagrangian as[18]

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{G_1^{ijkl}}{\Lambda^2}(\bar{Q'^i_L}\gamma_\mu Q'^j_L)(\bar{L'^k_L}\gamma^\mu L'^l_L) \quad (5)$$

$$+\frac{G_2^{ijkl}}{\Lambda^2}(\bar{Q'^i_L}\gamma_\mu \sigma^I Q'^j_L)(\bar{L'^k_L}\gamma^\mu \sigma^I L'^l_L). \quad (6)$$

Here i, j, k and l are the generation indices and Q' and L' are the quark and lepton doublets in the gauge basis. The transformation from gauge basis to mass basis are given by

$$u'_L = U u_L, \quad d'_L = D d_L, \quad l'_L = L l_L, \quad \nu'_L = L\nu_L. \quad (7)$$

the primed spinors has all three generation of fermions and U, D, and L are 3×3 unitary matrices. Here we assume the mixing only between second and third generation[20]. So that D and L are simply rotation matrices in 2-3 space, having angles θ_{bs} and $\theta_{\mu\tau}$ associated with them. Now on transforming to the mass basis the new physics couplings can be written as,

$$G_{(1,2)}^{ijkl} = g_{(1,2)} X^{ij} Y^{kl} \quad (8)$$

where X and Y relevant for the process $b \to s l^+ l^-$ are given by,

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin^2\theta_{bs} & -\sin\theta_{bs}\cos\theta_{bs} \\ 0 & -\sin\theta_{bs}\cos\theta_{bs} & \cos^2\theta_{bs} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin^2\theta_{\mu\tau} & -\sin\theta_{\mu\tau}\cos\theta_{\mu\tau} \\ 0 & -\sin\theta_{\mu\tau}\cos\theta_{\mu\tau} & \cos^2\theta_{\mu\tau} \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

The effective Hamiltonian relevant for the $b \to s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-$, $b \to c\ell_i\bar{\nu}_j$ and $b \to s\nu\bar{\nu}$ processes are given by

$$H_{eff}(b \to s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-) = -\frac{\alpha G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \Big[C_9^{ij}(\bar{s}_L\gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{l}_i\gamma_\mu l_j) + C_{10}^{ij}(\bar{s}_L\gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{l}_i\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 l_j)\Big] \quad (11)$$

$$H_{eff}(b \to c\ell_i\bar{\nu}_j) = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} C_V^{ij}(\bar{c}_L\gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{l}_{iL}\gamma_\mu \nu_{jL}) \quad (12)$$

$$H_{eff}(b \to s\nu\bar{\nu}) = -\frac{\alpha G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb}V_{ts}^* C_L^{ij} (\bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{\nu}_i \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma^5)\nu_j) \quad (13)$$

where new physics contributions to the Wilson coefficients are as

$$\begin{aligned} C_9^{\mu\mu} &= -C_{10}^{\mu\mu} = -\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}\alpha G_F V_{tb}V_{ts}^*} \frac{g_1+g_2}{\Lambda^2} \\ &\times \sin\theta_{bs}\cos\theta_{bs}\sin^2\theta_{\mu\tau} \quad (14) \\ C_V^{ij} &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}G_F V_{cb}} \frac{2g_2}{\Lambda^2} \Big(-V_{cs}\sin\theta_{bs}\cos\theta_{bs} \\ &+ V_{cb}\cos^2\theta_{bs}\Big) Y^{ij} \\ C_L^{ij} &= -\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}\alpha G_F V_{tb}V_{ts}^*} \frac{(g_1-g_2)}{\Lambda^2} \\ &\times \sin\theta_{bs}\cos\theta_{bs} Y^{ij} \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

here the couplings g_1 and g_2 depend upon the specific new physics models.

A. SM-like vector bosons

We consider a vector bosons having the transformation $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3},0)$ under the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ which is same as the SM vector boson.

The couplings of the vector bosons to the left-handed third-generation fermions in the gauge basis are given by

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_V = g_{qV}^{33}\ (\overline{Q}'_{L3}\gamma^\mu\sigma^I Q'_{L3})V_\mu^I + g_{lV}^{33}\ (\overline{L}'_{L3}\gamma^\mu\sigma^I L'_{L3})V_\mu^I \quad (16)$$

On integrating out this heavy vector boson and then using the Eq. (6), it is easy to see that

$$g_1 = 0, \qquad g_2 = -g_{qV}^{33} g_{\ell V}^{33}. \quad (17)$$

Further we assume that $g_{qV}^{33} = g_{lV}^{33} = \sqrt{0.5}$. By transforming from gauge basis to mass basis, it turns out that the vector bosons couple to other generations as well. The Z' contributes at tree level to $b \to s\mu^+\mu^-$ and $b \to s\nu\bar{\nu}$ decays whereas the W' contributes to $b \to c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ decay the at tree level. In this model the four quark operator is also generated at the tree level. In the mass basis this can be written as

$$\frac{(g_{qV}^{33})^2}{2m_V^2}\sin^2\theta_{bs}\cos^2\theta_{bs}\ \ (\bar{s_L}\gamma^\mu b_L)(\bar{s_L}\gamma_\mu b_L). \quad (18)$$

This gives contribution to B_s-$\bar{B_s}$ mixing. The new physics contribution to the Wilson coefficient along with SM can be written as

$$C_{VLL} = C_{VLL}^{SM} + \frac{(g_{qV}^{33})^2}{2m_V^2}\frac{16\pi^2}{G_F^2 m_W^2 (V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)^2}\sin^2\theta_{bs}\cos^2\theta_{bs}. \quad (19)$$

here

$$C_{VLL}^{SM} = \eta_{B_s} x_t \Big[1 + \frac{9}{1-x_t} - \frac{6}{(1-x_t)^2} - \frac{6x_t^2\log x_t}{(1-x_t)^3}\Big] \quad (20)$$

the QCD constant $\eta_{B_s} = 0.551$ and $x_t = m_t^2/m_W^2$.

B. $SU(2)_L$-singlet vector leptoquark (U_1)

We consider an $SU(2)_L$ singlet vector leptoquark U_1 which transforms as $(\mathbf{3},\mathbf{1},4/3)$. Its interaction with the third generation in the gauge basis is defined by [45]

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{U_1} = g_{U_1}^{33}(\overline{Q}'_{L3}\gamma^\mu L'_{L3})U_{1\mu} + \text{h.c.} \quad (21)$$

Similarly, on integrating out this heavy leptoquark and then using the Eq. (6), we find

$$g_1 = g_2 = -\frac{1}{2}|g_{U_1}^{33}|^2 < 0 \quad (22)$$

here from now on we assume $g_{U_1}^{33} = 1$.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section we present the results of our global fits for the SM like vector boson and U_1 leptoquark model. We assume 1 TeV mass for both the heavy vector boson as well as the leptoquark. In the vector boson model we have 114 degrees of freedom, these include the constraints from $b \to cl\bar{\nu}$, various $b \to s\mu^+\mu^-$ processes and $B_s - \bar{B_s}$ mixing. In this case we find $\chi^2_{SM} = 137$.

Whereas in leptoquark model the constraints from $B_s - \bar{B_s}$ mixing is not sensitive as this occurs at the loop level. For this model we also have 114 degrees of freedom as we perform the fits to θ_{bs} for the fixed value of $\theta_{\mu\tau}$ to avoid large correlations and $\chi^2_{SM} = 132$. The fit results are summarized in the Table-I and Table-II. Both the model provide good fit to the data. This is evident from the large pull $=\sqrt{\chi^2_{SM} - \chi^2_{min}}$ (≥ 4) obtained in both the models.

$\theta_{\mu\tau}(rad.)$	$\theta_{bs}(rad.)\times 10^3$	pull
0.64 ± 0.12	4.34 ± 1.6	4.2

TABLE I: Best fit values of the mixing angles and the pull obtained in the vector boson model.

$\theta_{\mu\tau}(rad.)$	$\theta_{bs}(rad.)\ \times 10^3$	pull
$\pi/16$	24.6 ± 5.7	4.6
$\pi/8$	6.2 ± 1.4	4.6
$3\pi/16$	2.7 ± 0.6	4.6
$\pi/4$	1.6 ± 0.4	4.7

TABLE II: Best fit values of the mixing angles and the pull obtained in U_1 leptoquark model.

Notice that in our global analyses the R_K and R_{K^*} measurement are not included explicitly in the fit. We also do not include the differential branching ratios for the $B^+ \to K^+e^+e^-$ and $B^0 \to K^{*0}e^+e^-$ modes. In order to see if these models can explain the present measurements of R_K and R_{K^*} we provide their predictions



FIG. 1: (color online) The left and right panels of the figure depicts predictions for R_K in vector boson model and leptoquark model.



FIG. 2: (color online) The left and right panels of the figure depicts predictions for R_{K^*} in vector boson model and leptoquark model.

using the best fit values obtained above. Using the global fit results for the new physics couplings, the predictions along with the LHCb measurements for R_K and R_{K^*} at 2σ-level in the low, central and high q^2-bins are given in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 respectively.

It can be easily seen from the figures that both these models can simultaneously explain the LHCb measurements of R_K and R_{K^*} (in the central q^2-bin) while being consistent with the R_D and R_{D^*} as well as all other relevant measurements in the B-sector. Hence these two new physics models are potential candidates to accommodate the signatures of the lepton non universality observed in the $b \to s\,\mu^+\,\mu^-$ and $b \to c\,\tau\,\bar{\nu}$ decays. Further, these models predict $R_K < 1$ and $R_{K^*} < 1$ in the high q^2 bin. As of now we do not have measurements of R_K and R_{K^*} in the high q^2 bin. However, LHCb is expected to provide a measurement of R_{K^*} in the high q^2 bin.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The recent measurement of R_{K^*} by the LHCb collaboration has reinforced the earlier hints of lepton universality violation observed in $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and R_K. In this work we look for simultaneous explanations of these measurements in SM like vector bosons and $SU(2)_L$-singlet vector leptoquark models. We first obtain constraints on new physics couplings by doing a global fit to all up to date data in B-sector. We then obtain predictions for R_{K^*} and R_K. We find that these models can explain the LHCb measurements of R_{K^*} and R_K while being consistent with the present measurements of $R_{D^{(*)}}$. Hence these models can simultaneously accommodate the measurements of R_K, R_{K^*}, R_D and R_{D^*}.

[1] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex]].
[2] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 072012 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex]].
[3] I. Adachi *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:0910.4301 [hep-ex].

[4] A. Bozek *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **82**, 072005 (2010) [arXiv:1005.2302 [hep-ex]].

[5] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 11, 111803 (2015) [Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 15, 159901 (2015)] [arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex]].

[6] M. Huschle *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 072014 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex]].

[7] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]].

[8] S. Bifani (on behalf of the LHCb Collaboration), "Search for New Physics with $b \to s\, l^+\, l^-$ decays at LHCb," talk given at CERN, April 18, 2017.

[9] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 191801 (2013) [arXiv:1308.1707 [hep-ex]].

[10] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1602**, 104 (2016) [arXiv:1512.04442 [hep-ex]].

[11] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1604.04042 [hep-ex].

[12] S. Descotes-Genon, T. Hurth, J. Matias and J. Virto, JHEP **1305**, 137 (2013) [arXiv:1303.5794 [hep-ph]].

[13] ATLAS Collaboration, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2017-023, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[14] CMS Collaboration, in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} =$ 8 TeV," Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-BPH-15-008, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[15] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1307**, 084 (2013) [arXiv:1305.2168 [hep-ex]].

[16] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1509**, 179 (2015) [arXiv:1506.08777 [hep-ex]].

[17] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, arXiv:1704.05340 [hep-ph]; W. Altmannshofer, P. Stangl and D. M. Straub, arXiv:1704.05435 [hep-ph]; G. Hiller and I. Nisandzic, arXiv:1704.05444 [hep-ph]; L. S. Geng, B. Grinstein, S. Jger, J. Martin Camalich, X. L. Ren and R. X. Shi, arXiv:1704.05446 [hep-ph]; M. Ciuchini, A. M. Coutinho, M. Fedele, E. Franco, A. Paul, L. Silvestrini and M. Valli, arXiv:1704.05447 [hep-ph]; G. D'Amico, M. Nardecchia, P. Panci, F. Sannino, A. Strumia, R. Torre and A. Urbano, arXiv:1704.05438 [hep-ph]; D. Beirevi and O. Sumensari, arXiv:1704.05835 [hep-ph]; A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, arXiv:1704.05672 [hep-ph]; Y. Cai, J. Gargalionis, M. A. Schmidt and R. R. Volkas, arXiv:1704.05849 [hep-ph]; F. Sala and D. M. Straub, arXiv:1704.06188 [hep-ph]; S. Di Chiara, A. Fowlie, S. Fraser, C. Marzo, L. Marzola, M. Raidal and C. Spethmann, arXiv:1704.06200 [hep-ph]; D. Ghosh, arXiv:1704.06240 [hep-ph].

[18] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. London and S. Shivashankara, Phys. Lett. B **742**, 370 (2015) [arXiv:1412.7164 [hep-ph]].

[19] R. Alonso, B. Grinstein and J. Martin Camalich, JHEP **1510**, 184 (2015) [arXiv:1505.05164 [hep-ph]].

[20] L. Calibbi, A. Crivellin and T. Ota, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 181801 (2015) [arXiv:1506.02661 [hep-ph]].

[21] S. Fajfer and N. Konik, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 270 (2016) [arXiv:1511.06024 [hep-ph]].

[22] M. Bauer and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 14, 141802 (2016) [arXiv:1511.01900 [hep-ph]].

[23] R. Barbieri, G. Isidori, A. Pattori and F. Senia, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 2, 67 (2016) [arXiv:1512.01560 [hep-ph]].

[24] D. Das, C. Hati, G. Kumar and N. Mahajan, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 055034 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.055034 [arXiv:1605.06313 [hep-ph]].

[25] N. Deshpand and X. G. He, arXiv:1608.04817 [hep-ph].

[26] S. Sahoo, R. Mohanta and A. K. Giri, arXiv:1609.04367 [hep-ph].

[27] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, J. P. Guvin, D. London and R. Watanabe, JHEP **1701**, 015 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2017)015 [arXiv:1609.09078 [hep-ph]].

[28] A. Crivellin, D. Mller and T. Ota, arXiv:1703.09226 [hep-ph].

[29] C. H. Chen, T. Nomura and H. Okada, arXiv:1703.03251 [hep-ph].

[30] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 101805 (2013) [arXiv:1307.5024 [hep-ex]].

[31] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS and LHCb Collaborations], Nature **522**, 68 (2015) [arXiv:1411.4413 [hep-ex]].

[32] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1406**, 133 (2014) [arXiv:1403.8044 [hep-ex]].

[33] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], "Measurements of the S-wave fraction in $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-\mu^+\mu^-$ decays and the $B^0 \to K^*(892)^0\mu^+\mu^-$ differential branching fraction," JHEP **1611**, 047 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2016)047 [arXiv:1606.04731 [hep-ex]].

[34] **CDF** Collaboration, *Updated Branching Ratio Measurements of Exclusive $b \to s\mu^+\mu^-$ Decays and Angular Analysis in $B \to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-$ Decays* , . CDF public note 10894.

[35] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 211802 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5364 [hep-ex]].

[36] ATLAS Collaboration, "Angular analysis of $B_d^0 \to K^*\mu^+\mu^-$ decays in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector," Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2017-023, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[37] CMS Collaboration, "Measurement of the P_1 and P_5' angular parameters of the decay $B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV," Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-BPH-15-008, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[38] F. James and M. Roos, Comput. Phys. Commun. **10**, 343 (1975).

[39] F. James and M. Winkler, "MINUIT User's Guide,"

[40] F. James, CERN-D-506, CERN-D506.

[41] David Straub, *flavio v0.11, 2016.* http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.59840

[42] A. K. Alok, B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Kumar, J. Kumar and D. London, arXiv:1704.07397 [hep-ph].

[43] A. K. Alok, B. Bhattacharya, D. Kumar, J. Kumar, D. London and S. U. Sankar, arXiv:1703.09247 [hep-ph].

[44] S. L. Glashow, D. Guadagnoli and K. Lane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 091801 (2015) [arXiv:1411.0565 [hep-ph]].

[45] Y. Sakaki, M. Tanaka, A. Tayduganov and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 9, 094012 (2013) [arXiv:1309.0301 [hep-ph]].